



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 150
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,710	03/10/2004	Michael E. Yoder	200314971-1	6166

22879 7590 03/22/2007
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BRADLEY, MATTHEW A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2187

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action has been issued in response to amendment filed 21 December 2006. Applicant's arguments have been carefully and fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by amendment. Accordingly, this action has been made FINAL.

Claim Status

Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 13-22 remain pending and are ready for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims **1-4, 7, 9-11, 13-14, 19, and 21-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) being unpatentable over Koenen (U.S. 2004/0019891), hereinafter referred to as Koenen, and in view of Elnozahy et al (U.S. 6,701,421), hereinafter referred to as Elnozahy,

As per independent claim **1**, Koenen teaches,

- providing a data structure including sets of equidistant physical memory localities; and (Paragraph 0026)

Art Unit: 2187

- selecting a preferred physical memory locality using a pointer to a locality within said data structure (Paragraph 0051).

Koenen does not explicitly teach, wherein the pointer is rotated amongst localities within a current equidistant set so as to provide for round-robin type selection amongst those equidistant physical memory localities.

Elnozahy teaches, wherein the pointer is rotated amongst localities within a current equidistant set so as to provide for round-robin type selection amongst those equidistant physical memory localities (Column 6 line 63 to Column 7 line 5).

Koenen and Elnozahy are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely, memory allocation.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both the teachings of Koenen and Elnozahy before him/her to combine the round robin allocation scheme of Elnozahy with Koenen for the benefit of equal portion allocation on each node.

The suggestion for doing so would have been that, in a striped allocation policy, blocks of address space are allocated among the nodes in a rotating manner such that a portion of the allocated memory resides on each of the nodes (Column 6 lines 63-67 of Elnozahy).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Koenen with Elnozahy for the benefit of equal portion allocation to each node to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1-4, 7, and 9-10.

As per dependent claim **2**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach, receiving an initial locality request including an indication of a search policy; and forming the data structure using physical memory localities within the system and using the search policy (Paragraph 0047 of Koenen).

As per dependent claim **3**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach, wherein the physical memory localities include local memories at cells in the system (Paragraph 0051 of Koenen).

As per dependent claim **4**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach, wherein the search policy comprises a "closest first" policy (Paragraph 0048 of Koenen).

As per dependent claim **7**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach, wherein the selection of the preferred locality is performed using a get "best"/"next best" iteration procedure (Paragraphs 0025-0026 of Koenen).

As per dependent claim **9**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach, wherein the determination of the preferred locality includes changing to a next equidistant set if there is no memory available in any locality of a current equidistant set (Paragraph 0037 of Koenen as shown in the description preceding with reference to paragraphs 0033-0036 of Koenen).

As per dependent claim **10**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach, further comprising returning an indication that no locality is available if no locality within any of the equidistant sets has sufficient memory (Paragraph 0052 of Koenen).

As per independent claim **11**, Koenen teaches,

Art Unit: 2187

- multiple symmetric multiprocessing (SMP) nodes; (Figure 1 as described in Paragraphs 0019-0021)
- multiple central processing units (CPUs) at each SMP node; (Figure 1, items 12A-12C for example, as described in Paragraphs 0019-0021)
- a memory control unit at each SMP node which is coupled to each CPU at that SMP node; (Figure 1, items 12I, 14I, and 16I as described in Paragraphs 0019-0021)
- shared memory at each SMP node which is accessible by way of the memory control unit at that SMP node; (Figure 1, items 12H, 14H, 16H, as described in Paragraphs 0019-0021)
- a switching system coupled to the memory control units so as to interconnect the multiple SMP nodes; (Figure 1, item 18 as described in Paragraphs 0019-0021)
- an operating system running on the CPUs; (Paragraph 0027, taught as 'the O/S')
- a virtual memory (VM) fault handler within the operating system; and (Paragraph 0047)
- a VM locality module within the operating system; and (Paragraph 0037)
- a data structure including sets of equidistant physical memory localities, wherein the VM locality module determines a preferred locality using a pointer to a locality within the data structure, and (Paragraph 0026 as shown in Table 2 directly beneath the paragraph).

Koenen does not explicitly teach, wherein the pointer is rotated amongst physical memory localities within a current equidistant set so as to provide for round-robin type selection amongst those equidistant physical memory localities.

Elnozahy teaches, wherein the pointer is rotated amongst physical memory localities within a current equidistant set so as to provide for round-robin type selection amongst those equidistant physical memory localities (Column 6 line 63 to Column 7 line 5).

Koenen and Elnozahy are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely, memory allocation.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both the teachings of Koenen and Elnozahy before him/her to combine the round robin allocation scheme of Elnozahy with Koenen for the benefit of equal portion allocation on each node.

The suggestion for doing so would have been that, in a striped allocation policy, blocks of address space are allocated among the nodes in a rotating manner such that a portion of the allocated memory resides on each of the nodes (Column 6 lines 63-67 of Elnozahy).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Koenen with Elnozahy for the benefit of equal portion allocation to each node to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11 and 13-14.

As per dependent claim **13**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach, wherein the preferred locality is determined using a "closest first" search policy (Paragraph 0048 of Koenen).

As per dependent claim **14**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach, wherein the data structure comprises a first set including a closest local memory locality and one or more other sets of equidistant localities (Paragraph 0048 and 0051 of Koenen).

As per independent claim **19**, Koenen teach,

- a data structure for use in selecting a physical memory locality in a multiprocessor system, the data structure being configured in accordance with a search policy and comprising multiple sets of equidistant physical memory localities under the search policy (Paragraph 0026 of Koenen as shown in Table 2 directly beneath the paragraph of Koenen).

Koenen does not explicitly teach, wherein a pointer is rotated amongst localities within a current equidistant set so as to provide for a round-robin type selection amongst those equidistant physical memory localities.

Elnozahy teaches,

- wherein a pointer is rotated amongst localities within a current equidistant set so as to provide for a round-robin type selection amongst those equidistant physical memory localities (Column 6 line 63 to Column 7 line 5 of Elnozahy).

Koenen and Elnozahy are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely, memory allocation.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both the teachings of Koenen and Elnozahy before him/her to combine the round robin allocation scheme of Elnozahy with Koenen for the benefit of equal portion allocation on each node.

The suggestion for doing so would have been that, in a striped allocation policy, blocks of address space are allocated among the nodes in a rotating manner such that a portion of the allocated memory resides on each of the nodes (Column 6 lines 63-67 of Elnozahy).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Koenen with Elnozahy for the benefit of equal portion allocation to each node to obtain the invention as specified in claims 19 and 21-22.

As per dependent claim **21**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach, wherein the search policy comprises an "closest first" policy, and wherein a first set comprises a most rapidly accessible memory locality (Paragraphs 0048 and 0051 of Koenen).

As per independent claim **22**, the combination of Koenen and Elnozahy teach,

- a virtual memory manager configured for extending a memory space beyond limits of a physical address space; (Paragraph 0027 of Koenen)
- a virtual memory locality module configured to rapidly select a physical memory locality in the system; and (Paragraph 0037 of Koenen).

Art Unit: 2187

- Using a pointer to a data structure having sets of equidistant physical memory localities, wherein the pointer is rotated amongst physical memory localities within a current equidistant set so as to provide for round-robin types selection amongst those equidistant physical memory localities (Column 6 line 63 to Column 7 line 5 of Elnozahy).
- a virtual memory fault handler configured to interrupt execution of the virtual memory manager when a page fault occurs and to utilize the virtual memory locality module to determine the physical memory locality from which to allocate memory in response to the page fault (Paragraph 0047 of Koenen).

Claims **5-6**, **15-18**, and **20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elnozahy and Koenen and further in view of Horstmann et al (U.S. 6,125,433), hereinafter referred to as Horstmann. (The Microsoft Computer Dictionary Fifth Edition is used as evidentiary support).

As per dependent claim **5**, the combination of Elnozahy and Koenen teach the limitations as noted supra.

The combination of Elnozahy and Koenen does not explicitly teach, wherein the physical memory localities further includes interleaved memory in the system.

Horstmann teaches, wherein the physical memory localities further includes interleaved memory in the system (Column 1 lines 57-67).

Elnozahy and Koenen and Horstmann are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely, memory allocation.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both the teachings of Elnozahy and Koenen, and Horstmann before him/her to combine the interleaved allocation of Horstmann with Elnozahy and Koenen for the benefit of reducing wait states and using available memory efficiently.

The suggestion for doing so would have been that, provides an efficient use of main memory. For example, a process's main memory allocation need not be contiguous; processes in main memory can be interleaved (Column 1 lines 61-64 of Horstmann). Further, in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, interleaved memory is defined as a method of organizing addresses in RAM memory in order to reduce wait states. Given this ordinary definition, with Elnozahy and Koenen, and Horstmann, it would have been obvious to implement interleaved memory into Elnozahy and Koenen to further improve the allocation methods of Elnozahy and Koenen.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Elnozahy and Koenen with Horstmann for the benefit of interleaved memory to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5-6, 15-18, and 20.

As per dependent claims **15-16**, and **18**, the combination of Elnozahy and Koenen with Horstmann teach, wherein the physical memory localities further includes interleaved memory in the system (Column 1 lines 61-64 of Horstmann).

As per dependent claim **6**, **17**, and **20**, the combination of Elnozahy and Koenen with Horstmann teach, wherein the search policy comprises an "interleaved first" type of policy (Column 1 lines 61-64 of Horstmann).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 21 December 2006 have been carefully and fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by amendment.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. U.S. 6,272,612 Bordaz et al teach a process for allocating memory in a multiprocessor data processing system (see also column 8 lines 60-64 that teach round-robin allocation).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2187

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew Bradley whose telephone number is (571) 272-8575. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald A. Sparks can be reached on (571) 272-4201. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BRP/mb



Brian R. Peugh
Primary Examiner

3/19/07